

REMARKS:

In the Office Action dated July 5, 2007, claims 1, 4-12 and 14-16, in the above-identified U.S. patent application were rejected. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-17 have been canceled and new claims 18-38 have been added to the application.

Claims 1, 4-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-17 have been canceled and new claims added to the application which clarify most of the language found indefinite. However, applicants point out that the language "high affinity specific binding partner" has a generally accepted definition in the art. This term is often used to describe specific high affinity interactions between biomolecules such as anti-interaction between antibody and antigen, saccharide and lectin, streptavidin/avidin and biotin. In view of the general knowledge in the art, applicants contend that this term is not indefinite. Regarding the language "planar fashion" and "site-specific fashion", the new claims recite the definitions for these term disclosed on page 7 (paragraph [0038] in the published application). This disclosure indicates that "application in planar fashion" means that hapten groups are applied to the complete surface of the carrier or a part thereof which comprises zones for receptor synthesis and adjacent zones on which no receptor synthesis is to take place and the language "application in site-specific fashion" means that the hapten groups are applied selectively onto respective single zones or groups of zones for the receptor synthesis. In view of the above amendments and discussion, applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5-7 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Edman. Applicants point out that Edman does not disclose a system where the haptens are applied to the same carrier as the receptors are synthesized on. The disclosure of antibody/antigen reactions at column 36 of Edman does not indicate that the antibody/antigen reactions occur in the presence of other reactions (i.e. synthesizing polymeric receptors) and Edman does not disclose a microfluidic carrier. In view of these differences, applicants contend that Edman does not anticipate new claims 18-38 and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Edman in view of Hiller and Lowery. Applicants respectfully point out that Lowery has an effective filing date of January 20, 2003 which is after the foreign priority dates of the present application. Thus, Lowery is not available as a reference against the present application. Lowery was cited for the disclosure of a microfluidic channel as neither Edman nor Hiller suggest or disclose the use of a carrier with microfluidic channels. Since Lowery is not available as a reference, and Edman and Hiller do not disclose microfluidic carriers, applicants contend that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious over the cited prior art and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 18-38 are now in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the telephone number below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fee for such an extension together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Monica Chin Kitts/
Monica Chin Kitts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,105
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK
1425 K. Street, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 783-6040

MCK/